REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 30-66 are pending, claims 30-32, 34-35, 39-40, 46-48, 50-53, 55-57, 59, 60, and 63 having been amended, and claims 64-66 having been added.

The Examiner is under the impression that Applicant has not filed a certified copy of the application as required by 35 U.S.C. § 119(b). Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that this is the National Phase of a PCT Application. The certified copy of the priority document was filed with the PCT application. A copy of the priority document should have been sent by the International Bureau. Applicant is not required to submit an additional copy of the priority document. Therefore, Applicant submits that foreign priority can be relied upon to overcome prior rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 30-32, 40-44, 46-48, 56 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,682,585 to Bouve et al. ("Bouve"). Applicant wishes to point out that the cited patent number does not correspond to the Bouve Patent. Applicant assumes that the Examiner meant to refer to U.S. Patent 5,682,5<u>25</u>. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection; however, the claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention and to further advance prosecution of this case.

Claims 30-32 and 40-44 recite a method of operating a computer system comprising storing on a first map server computer coordinate data indicative of spatial coordinates of at least one point associated with a geographical area represented by a map, so as to enable correlation of points on the map with their corresponding geographical location, and storing on a second information server information data relating to at least one place of interest

30077539_1.DOC

within the geographical area, the information data including data representative of the spatial coordinates of the place of interest within the area.

Bouve discloses a system for remotely determining a position of a selected category of items of interest in a selected geographic vicinity from a database. Bouve is entirely different from the claimed invention in that Bouve discloses using a single database storage memory 139 for holding both map data and information relating to items of interest. See Column 2, lines 7-9, which states that "geographic vicinity" and "map" are defined as being used to denote a geographic region which includes and surrounds selected items of interest. Column 4, line 66 through Column 5, line 13 and Column 12, lines 19-24 describe that database 12 in a database storage memory 139 includes maps of geographic vicinities as well as information data relating to places of interest.

Bouve does not disclose the above-mentioned limitation of claims 30-32 and 40-44 for the above-mentioned reasons. For example, Bouve does not disclose storing computer map data on a first map server and storing information data relating to at least one place of interest within a geographical area on a second information server. Bouve discloses that the corresponding information is stored in one database in the same computer.

Claims 46-48 and 56 recite a first map server computer for storing map data and a second information server computer for storing information data. As mentioned-above, Bouve discloses a single computer for storing map and information data.

Similarly, claim 63 recites a first map server computer for storing map data and a second information server computer for storing information data.

30077539_1.DOC

Because Bouve does not disclose each and every limitation of the claims, Applicant submits that claims 30-32, 40-44, 46-48, 56 and 63 are not anticipated by Bouve and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant also wishes to emphasize that having all map and information data in a single database storage memory, as disclosed in Bouve, is much more simple when compared to the invention, as claimed, in which it is necessary to carefully control how data is stored on the map server and the information server computers to ensure that the map data and the information data are correctly retrieved and displayed at a client computer. It is submitted that it would not have been obvious to the skilled person to provide a system in which the map data and the information data are stored on different computers as there is no disclosure or motivation in Bouve et al. to do so. Furthermore, it is submitted that it would not have been obvious even to the skilled person how to provide a system in which the map data and the information data can be stored on different computers in a way that enables a client to access the two types of data in a correlated way so that both a map and information data can be properly displayed on the visual display unit of the client computer. The present invention allows for the logical separation of the provision of maps and the provision of information data to be overlaid on the maps. This means that providers of goods or services need not concern themselves with the details of having to provide maps for display on a client visual display unit. On the contrary, such providers need only ensure that their own information is up to date. It is a particular advantage that the information server does not need to have knowledge of the map server software provided on the map server and vice versa. This is already discussed in the present application, see for example page 6 of the specification of the present application.

30077539_1.DOC

The Examiner rejected claims 38-39 and 54-55, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Bouve in view of Arikawa XP 000612712 ("Arikawa"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant observed that for retrieving information from the Internet, the lack of a physical "place" is an advantage. A consumer, no matter where his location, is presented with a familiar interface, which makes access very straightforward. However, the Internet or World Wide Web is not well suited to answering questions about places and proximity. For example, it was not possible to use existing web search tools to answer questions such as "where is the nearest hamburger restaurant?".

Applicant addresses the above problem by developing a method of operating a computer system comprising storing on a first map server computer map data representative of a map of a geographical area, and storing on a second information server computer information data relating to at least one place of interest within a geographical area. The map data is utilized to display an image of the map on a visual data unit associated with a client computer. The client computer transmits an information request to an information server computer and the information server computer transmits to the client computer in response to the information request, information data relating to at least one place of interest within the geographical area. Information data relating to at least one place of interest is displayed on a visual display unit, as recited in claim 30.

As previously mentioned, Bouve teaches using a single database memory on a single physical computer.

Arikawa teaches so called "dynamic maps" being built up or assembled. Arikawa teaches that the various geographic databases store sets of data of certain facilities. Arikawa

30077539_1.DOC

- 16 -

takes an object-oriented programming approach (OOP). Data are stored as "conceptual objects." However, Applicant submits that Arikawa teaches away from the invention. For example, at the end of the left Column on page 591 of Arikawa, it is stated that "[t]he geographic information services through the current style WWW, however, cannot provide any other data but image data, because of the simple treatment of all visual information. The limitation cannot allow users to compose multiple geographic information retrieved from varied servers as one map." Yet, Applicant's invention does combine image data and multiple geographic information data from varied servers as one map.

Applicant submits that neither Bouve nor Arikawa disclose, teach or suggest storing map data on a map server computer and storing information data on an information server computer, as recited in claims 38-39 and as similarly recited in claims 54-55. Therefore, Applicant request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 57-62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bouve in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,810 to Sotiroff et al. ("Sotiroff"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Sotiroff patent was filed on January 29, 1996. The present application receives the benefit of foreign priority dating back to August 16, 1995. Clearly, with the benefit of foreign priority, Sotiroff is not a prior art reference.

Claims 57-62 depend either from claim 30 or from claim 46 and are patentable over Bouve for the reasons mentioned above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

New claim 64 recites a map server computer and an information server computer, as in claim 46, and is patentable for the same reasons regarding claim 46.

30077539_1.DOC

New claim 65 and 66 are directed toward a client computer which includes means for transmitting a map request to a map server computer and means for transmitting an information request to an information computer. For the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that the Bouve reference, as well as other cited prior art does not disclose the above-mentioned features. Therefore, Applicant submits that new claims 65 and 66 are patentable.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 33-37 and 49-53 contain allowable subject matter. Applicant wishes to point out that claims 33-37 and 45 are patentable, for the reasons mentioned above, for citing the same features as claim 30, as well as for reciting other important features. Applicant also wishes to point out that claims 49-53 are patentable, for the reasons mentioned above, for citing the same features as claim 46, as well as for reciting other important features.

All rejections and objections having been addressed, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY MADISON & SUTRO LLP

By: _Richard C. Irving_
Richard C. Irving
Reg. No. 38,499
Tel. (202) 861-3788
Fax No.: (202) 822-0944

DSL/RCI:ksh

100 New York Avenue, N.W
9th Floor, East Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005-3918
Tel: (202) 861-3000

30077539_1.DOC